

## **REMARKS**

Applicant encloses English translations of the Abstract of EP0974786 and the claims of FR998361 and respectfully requests the Examiner to consider these two references. As for EP0974786 applicant notes that a headlamp for a vehicle is disclosed which is formed with a light source, a reflecting mirror system and a projecting system. A reflecting mirror 10 as the reflecting mirror system and a reflecting mirror 20 and a projecting lens 30 as the projecting system are included. The projecting system can move along an optical axis while a distance between the reflecting mirror 20 and the projecting lens 30 is fixed. As for FR998361 applicant submits that none of the drawing views teach using the screw mechanism as a means for varying the distance between the light source and the forward projecting means. With respect to TW199546, applicant notes that the Taiwan Examiner cited this patent to show distance varying means, as recited in claim 6. The Taiwan asserted that Fig. 2 of this document disclosed the technical feature for making a distance between a lamp and a focus of a reflecting mirror adjustable using a combination of a sleeve and a screw. The screw, however, is turned only to fix or release the sleeve, which is apparently different from the screw mechanism of the present application. Therefore, the filing of a partial English translation appears to be unnecessary with respect to Taiwan 199546 .

On page 10 of the specification at line 26, “8e” has been changed to –8s–, as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the substance of claim 5, which has been cancelled and to add the recitation “while the light source is positioned fixedly

relative to the reflecting mirror”. Claims 1-4 , 6 and 7 remain for consideration.

Claims 1-6 were previously rejected as being anticipated by Petterson. Applicant submits that claims 1-4 and 6 are patentable over Petterson. According to the present invention, the illumination apparatus comprises a distance varying means that can vary the distance between the forward projecting means and the light source, while the light source is positioned fixedly relative to the reflecting mirror. By this feature, the light distribution pattern can be formed by two light distribution mechanisms of the forward projecting means and the reflecting mirror and the light arriving at the reflecting mirror from the light source is always projected forward with a good directivity as parallel rays parallel to the optical axis (see page 3, lines 16-18). Therefore, even if the illumination range ahead is expanded by an operation of varying the position of the forward projecting means or the like, the luminance at the center region ahead can always be kept at a predetermined level or higher.

The invention is not suggested or taught by Petterson. Petterson comprises an illumination apparatus having a light source and a parabolic reflector and a Fresnel lens (see column 3, lines 50-54. The light source (18) can be movably positioned along the principle axis fo the parabolic reflector ( see column 4, lines 48-53). In Petterson, the only variation of the position of the light source is relative to the reflecting mirror (parabolic reflector). Thus, the illumination apparatus does not comprise a distance varying means that can vary a distance between a forward projecting (Fresnel lens 14) and the light source while the light source is positioned fixedly relative tot he reflecting mirror. Therefore, Petterson does not disclose the illumination apparatus including a distance varying means that can vary a distance between the forward projecting means and the light source while the light source is positioned fixedly relative

to the reflecting mirror. Petterson does not anticipate revised claim 1. Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over claim 1 and should be allowed.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 6 should be allowed together with claim 1.

Claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Petterson in view of Lindner. Lindner was cited to show an LED light source. However, Lindner does not overcome the shortcomings of Petterson noted above. There is no suggestion in Lindner of illumination apparatus including a distance varying means that can vary a distance between the forward projecting means and the light source while the light source is positioned fixedly relative to the reflecting mirror. Claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 1, and includes the limitations thereof, defines patentable subject matter and should be allowed together with claim 1.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are solicited.

Date: October 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 


Seymour Rothstein (Reg. No. 19,369)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.  
20 North Wacker Drive  
36th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 580-1180



**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper and its attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 18, 2005.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Seymour Rothstein (Reg. No. 19,369)